

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated September 1, 2004, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on December 1, 2004. Claims 1-10 are currently pending in the application. The Examiner indicated claims 1-7 are allowed and the Examiner rejected claims 8-10 as being anticipated by *Haskett, et al.* Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Examiner Interview

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for conducting the interview on November 30, 2004. The arguments and amendments herein are presented in accordance with the substance of the interview to place the application in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Examiner rejected claims 8-10 as being anticipated by *Haskett, et al.* (U.S. 5,253,682). In response, Applicants have amended claim 8.

As amended, claim 8 includes the limitation of an extendable arm for providing a fluid pathway into the piping system from at least one acetylene cylinder. *Haskett, et al.* does not disclose an extendable arm for providing a fluid pathway into the piping system from at least one acetylene cylinder. *Haskett, et al.* therefore fails to teach each and every limitation of claims 8-10 as amended. For these reasons, Applicants submit that claims 8-10 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request withdrawal of the § 102(b) rejection of claims 8-10.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner indicated claims 1-7 are allowed. Applicants appreciate allowance of claims 1-7.

New Claims

Claims 11-20 have been added to more clearly define aspects of the present invention. Applicants submit that no new matter has been added. For similar reasons as discussed herein, Applicants believe that the references cited by the Examiner, alone or in combination, do not teach, show, or suggest the subject matter of new claims 11-20. Therefore, Applicants believe new claims 11-20 are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request allowance of the same.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the references cited by the Examiner, alone or in combination, do not teach, show, or suggest the invention as claimed.

The secondary references made of record are noted. However, it is believed that the secondary references are no more pertinent to the Applicant's disclosure than the primary references cited in the office action. Therefore, Applicants believe that a detailed discussion of the secondary references is not necessary for a full and complete response to this office action.

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



Walter C. Grollitsch
Registration No. 48,678
MOSER, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicants